



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in an elaborate and heavily documented note tracing the various explanations of the name *Cymry*, says nothing of Ritson's highly respectable discussion of the word (*Annals of the Caledonians*, etc., I, 16, note) nor of Ritson's indignant protest against Pinkerton's attempt to connect the *Cymry* with the *Cimbri*, although he mentions the fanciful etymologies of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Theophilus Evans and even takes account of the vaporizing of George Borrow. Holmes (*Ancient Britain*, p. 418, note) takes note of Borlase's advocacy of the theory that the Caledonians were Germans, but says nothing of Ritson's contrary opinion, although it is that of the most modern authorities. Dr. Burd implies (pp. 170 f.) that recent opinion substantiates Ritson's thesis that the Picts were Celts, but the question is still *sub iudice*. Except the late D'Arbois de Jubainville, probably few recent Celticists of high standing would admit that the evidence justifies even so much as the assertion that the Picts were Aryans (cf. Holmes, *op. cit.*, pp. 409 ff.). One of Ritson's chief services in this connection is his contention, in opposition to Pinkerton, that the Picts were not Germanic. It is to be noted, however, that the tradition of Pinkerton is still influential in that monument of misguided industry, David MacRitchie's *Testimony of Tradition* (London, 1890). Had MacRitchie utilized even such data as are accessible in the works of Ritson, he would have avoided much fantastic theorizing on the origin of British folk traditions. Attention should certainly be drawn to Ritson's valuable bibliography (in part critical) of books on Celtic languages and antiquities contained in *The Memoirs of the Celts or Gauls* (pp. 318 ff.) and to the justness of his estimate of such works as those of Pelloutier, Mallet, and Stukeley. A full discussion of Ritson's investigations in Celtic antiquities and of his vision, even through a glass darkly, of the facts of ancient British history would require far more space than can be devoted to the matter here. In any case, an adequate notion of the problems attacked by Ritson can hardly be derived from the brief summary of modern opinion contained in Deniker's little handbook, to which Dr. Burd refers.

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse. Part I. List of Manuscripts. By CARLETON BROWN. Oxford: Printed for the Bibliographical Society, at the University Press, 1916. Pp. xv+528.

In a Foreword the compiler explains the purpose and scope of his work, which unlike other Middle English bibliographies is based on the manuscripts. The first volume, arranged according to libraries, takes up the manuscripts which contain Middle English religious and didactic verse, and gives a list of all items of that character found in each. This volume is to be followed by a second, which will contain "an alphabetical index of

first lines, with citation under each entry of all manuscripts containing the piece in question and with references to printed texts in the case of those which have already been published." The index will make the *Register* much more convenient for reference than it now is, for at a glance one will be able to find a record of all the manuscripts in which a particular poem is to be found. But even in its present incomplete form the bibliography is not difficult to use. Most scholars who really desire to learn in what manuscripts a poem appears will not object to devoting a relatively small number of hours to running through the volume.

Of the value of such a work to the student of Middle English literature there can be no doubt. As Professor Brown says, "So long as it is necessary in embarking on any particular inquiry in this field to make a general search through the manuscript collections, literary research in Middle English must continue to be laborious and uncertain, for no secure foundation can be laid except upon the basis of complete knowledge of the original sources." His volume relieves the scholar of need for such a search in at least one part of that field.

It is to be noted, moreover, that the *Register* gives references to hitherto little known or even entirely unknown versions of poems. (Professor Wells's *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* affords the most convenient means of determining what manuscripts of a given poem have been generally known.) Thus we find three new copies of the *Trental of Gregory* (see pp. 132, 456, 494), one of *The Stacions of Rome* (p. 286), and one of the *Debate between the Body and the Soul* (p. 419). There are doubtless many similar cases.

From page 457 to page 521 Professor Brown lists the manuscripts of religious poems in private collections. This is the most difficult part of the field to cover, because with the dispersal of private collections such manuscripts pass into other hands. Probably every scholar of mediaeval literature has had the unpleasant experience of finding a reference in some catalogue to a manuscript in private ownership and not being able to discover what has become of it. Professor Brown gives much valuable information about the present ownership of such manuscripts, but even he is compelled to state at times, "Present owner unknown." At least one manuscript seems not to be entered at all, that described as "a fine early copy (on a roll of parchment) of *The Stacions of Rome*," owned by Reginald Cholmondeley, Esq., of Condover Hall, Shropshire (*Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, V, 333-34). Absolute completeness, however, cannot be expected in a work of this kind, and discovery even of several omissions would not absolve the student of mediaeval English literature from the gratitude which he ought to feel to Professor Brown for gathering and publishing the materials necessary to a knowledge of Middle English religious poetry.

J. R. HULBERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO